

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/313,535 05/13/99 PARULSKI

K 73251/PRC

001333
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER NY 14650-2201

TM01/0824

EXAMINER

CHRISTENSEN, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED:

08/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/313,535

Applicant(s)
Parulski et al.

Examiner
Andy Christensen

Art Unit
2612



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 16, 2001

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 26-31, 33, and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 26-31, 33, and 35-38 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2612

1. This application has been transferred to another examiner.
2. The Applicants' arguments filed April 16, 2001 have been fully considered by the Examiner but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

The Applicants argue that the images stored by the Yamada et al. camera are transferred to a reproduction unit that is internal to the camera. However Yamada et al. disclose on the last three lines of Section 0021 that the reproducing operations may be carried out by employing a "separately provided reproducing apparatus", a separately provided apparatus clearly being external to the camera.

The Applicants argue that Yamada et al. fail to disclose or suggest assigning selected tag names to each captured image wherein each tag name provides classification of two or more captured images. However Yamada et al. disclose this feature in that the codes are based on sorts of photographic objects being recorded in correspondence with the images of the objects, in other words plural sorts of objects, each having plural images (Section 0003); "multiple reproduction every designated classification code (Section 0004); "sequentially reproducing an image when a classification code is designated by the classification code designating means during reproducing operation" (Section 0004); "while a classification code is designated, images are reproduced one by one in accordance with a designated order" (Section 0011); "sequentially read out the pictures

Art Unit: 2612

from the memory circuit 20 in a sequential order, depending upon the classification code" (Section 0012).

The Applicants argue that Yamada et al. do not disclose or suggest means responsive to a single request for identifying a particular tag name for transferring all of the image files stored in the corresponding tag name file to an external computer via a cable interface.

In response, the CPU in Yamada et al. instructs the memory control circuit so as to sequentially read out the pictures from the memory circuit in a sequential order, depending on the classification code (Section 0012). Therefore a single request that identifies a particular tag name results in the transfer of all of the image files stored in accordance with the corresponding tag file name. This transfer may be to a "separately provided reproducing apparatus" (Section 0021), therefore clearly suggesting an external computer, such a transfer inherently requiring a cable for the transmission of the image data.

The Applicants argue that Sarbadhikari's direction of image transfer is to the camera and not from the camera. However, Sarbadhikari specifically teaches image data transfer from the camera (Column 11, Lines 22-26).

Art Unit: 2612

The Applicants argue that Sarbadhikari does not discuss selective downloading of images from the camera to the computer. However, as discussed previously, Yamada discloses selective image reproduction..

The Applicants argue that Sarbadhikari does not teach or suggest image classification using tag names. However Yamada discloses this feature in the use of classification codes as discussed previously.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the removable memory card" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the categories" in lines 4-5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2612

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made. 1.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 28-31, 33 and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada (No. Hei 5-344460) in view of Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264).

As for claim 1, Yamada discloses an electronic still camera connected to a reproduction unit comprising:

an image sensor (p.3; electronic still camera; see figure 1);

a converter stage (p. 23 section 21, lines 1-6));

a memory of storing two or more tag names providing classification of images (p. 6, lines 1-9);

a control means for selecting one of the stored tag names for each of the images (key input unit; 8);

a processor for assigning the selected tag names to each of the images captured by the image sensor, wherein each tag name provides classification of two or more captured images (p. 7, lines 2-15);

Art Unit: 2612

means for generating an image file including the digital image data corresponding to the captured images and a separate tag name file for each selected tag name (changing the classification code of an image by deleting a pre existing classification code; page 17, section 14 lines 1-20);

a removable memory (14) for storing each of the image files into the tag name file corresponding to the selected tag name, wherein the removable memory stores two or more tag name files with each tag name file storing two or more image files (p 12, lines 5-26; p. 16, lines 9-14); and

means responsive to a single computer initiated request for identifying a particular tag name for transferring all of the image files stored in the corresponding tag name file (p. 16, lines 9-14) to an external reproducing device (p. 23, last 3 lines), such an operation inherently requiring a cable.

Yamada fails to specifically disclose that the separate reproducing device is a computer. However, it is well known in the art to connect a camera with a computer for the transfer of image data thereto as taught by Sarbadhikari et al. (Column 11, Lines 22-26).

In the same field of endeavor, Sarbadhikari et al. disclose a camera connected to a computer via a cable whereby image data is transferred from the camera to the computer (Column 11, Lines 22-26). Processing of Yamada's image data in a computer would clearly enable increased sophistication of image processing of the taken images and would increase the degree to

Art Unit: 2612

which the processed images would be available to other processing, reproducing and/or viewing facilities, thereby clearly increasing the utility of the device. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a camera to connect the Yamada camera to an external computer via cable in order to increase the utility of the device.

As for claim 2, Yamada discloses the tag names are input by the user and then stored in the memory (can be externally generated by speaking or keying). However, Yamada fails to disclose an embodiment where default tag names are stored in firmware of the memory. However the Sarbadhikari et al. camera uses instruction code stored in a firmware. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that tag names can be stored in a firmware memory, as such would not overly increase the cost of the system and such a memory is source for camera operating information.

As for claim 3-4, Yamada discloses that the tag names are input by a control means and then stored in the memory (can be externally generated by speaking or keying). Yamada also discloses a LCD (#7) which is a status display which shows tag names. However, Yamada fails to disclose an embodiment where default tag names are stored in firmware of the memory. Sarbadhikari et al. disclose the claimed features, as illustrated in figure 9. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature as taught by Sarbadhikari et al. which helps ease the user in deriving tag names/overlays for images and adds an quick help/ default feature to the system .

Art Unit: 2612

As for claim 5, the files are stored in a section of the memory as displayed by the track map display (see page 1 of Yamada).

As for claim 6, Yamada fails to disclose that the images are displayed with titles/classifications overlaid on the images. However, Sarbadhikari et al. disclose that the tag names are overlaid on the image data (col. 10, lines 25-35). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature as taught by Sarbadhikari et al., as another way of confirming the classification of each particular image and not destroy the image data.

As for claim 7, in another embodiment (see figure 10), the user may input classification codes by speaking (voice recognition) or key input (Section 0017).

As for claim 9, see figure 7-8.

As for claims 10 and 12, see Examiner's notes in claim 7 and 1.

As for claim 13, see Examiner's notes in claim 1. Additionally, Yamada discloses the tag names are input by the user and then stored in the memory (can be externally generated by speaking or keying).

Art Unit: 2612

As for claim 15, speech input elements #29 and 30 in figure 10. Sarbadhikari et al., in the camera connected to computer embodiment, discloses that image overlays (customized tag names) can be uploaded to the computer and then downloaded to the camera via cable into a signal port in the camera . Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that tag name information can be externally input from a signal port in the camera via an input unit on the camera side or from the computer. Such allows multiple access to data manipulation, thus system flexibility.

As for claim 28, see Examiner's notes in claim 15.

As for claims 29-30, see Examiner's notes in claim 1.

As for claims 31 and 33, the control means is a user control means.

As for claims 35 and 37, the reproduction unit selects the tag name according the user request in Yamada. In Sarbadhikari et al., the tag names may also be selected on the computer according to user request (see abstract).

As for claims 36 and 38, see Examiner's notes in claims 35, 37 and 1.

Art Unit: 2612

5. Claims 8, 11, 14 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Sarbadhikari et al., further in view of Yoshida (US 5,515,101).

As for claim 8, see Examiners notes in claim 7. In addition, Yamada and Sarbadhikari et al. fail to specifically disclose the tag names are alphanumeric names. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Yoshida. In the same field of endeavor, Yoshida discloses a camera system(see figure 9) for capturing images comprising a memory means (7) for storing a plurality of tag names (titles: wedding, baby etc) providing classification of the images by subject; and a processor means (26) for having the capability of assigning the tag names to the images captured by the image sensor, each category provide a subject classification of one or more images (col. 2, lines 59-67). At col. 8, lines 60-65, Yoshida discloses that titles overlaid on image can be alphanumeric (text strings). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that tag names can be alphanumeric as it increases the quantity of available unique for categorizing images.

As for claim 11, see Examiners notes in claim 9 and 8.

As for claim 14, see Examiner's notes in claim 13. In addition, Yoshida discloses the tiles are stored with attribute which is a date and time information from a internal clock. (Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Art Unit: 2612

As for claim 26, see Examiner's notes in claim 7. In addition, Yoshida discloses a memory is loadable , thus inherently signal port.

As for claim 27, see Examiner's notes in claim 15. In addition, the external computer can write tag names onto a card and transfer then to the camera off the card. See figures 8A and 10 of Yoshida.

6. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2612

8. Any inquiry regarding this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Christensen whose telephone number is (703) 308-9644.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

ac
August 23, 2001



ANDREW B. CHRISTENSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER